

REMARKS

The undersigned attorney and his colleague, Aaron Poledna, wish to thank the Examiner for holding a personal interview on November 4, 2008, to discuss the present Office Action, the Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka references, and the pending claims. The applicants request that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary. If the Examiner notices any deficiencies with this paper in this regard, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to correct such deficiencies.

Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 13, and 15-29 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 17, and 23 have been amended. More specifically, claims 1, 17, and 23 have been amended to further clarify certain aspects of these claims to expedite prosecution, and without prejudice to pursuing the subject matter of these claims in unamended or other forms in a continuation or other application.

In the Office Action mailed July 22, 2008, pending claims 1, 3-5, 9, 13, and 15-29 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claims 1, 3, 4, 15-20, and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,941,387 to Takihara ("Takihara"), U.S. Patent No 5,579,297 to Childers et al. ("Childers"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,871,239 to Tanaka ("Tanaka");

(B) Claims 5 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0043799 to Okada et al. ("Okada");

(C) Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0043799 to Chen ("Chen");

(D) Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and U.S. Patent No. 7,113,409 to Whitted ("Whitted"); and

(E) Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0043799 to Muzaffer et al. ("Muzaffer").

The following remarks summarize and expand on the results of the November 4th personal interview, and they also reflect the agreements reached between Mr. Pilling, Mr. Poledna, and the Examiner during the personal interview. For example, the following remarks reflect the Examiner's acknowledgement that the proposed amendment to claim 1 would distinguish this claim over the applied references. Claim 1 has been so amended and, accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of this claim and the claims depending therefrom (claims 3-5, 9, 13, 15, and 16) should be withdrawn.

A. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, 15-20, and 23-28
(Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 15-20, and 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka. As stated above, the Examiner acknowledged during the November 4th personal interview that the combination of Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka fails to support a Section 103 rejection of amended claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom (claims 3, 4, 15, and 16). Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 15, and 16 should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 17 and 23 include several features generally similar to those of claim 1 (e.g., the optical reading and/or writing device removably received within the housing). Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of independent claims 17 and 23 over the combination of Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, and for the additional features of these independent claims.

Claims 18-20 depend from base claim 17 and claims 24-28 depend from base claim 23. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 18-20 and 24-28 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to base claims 17 and 23, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

B. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 5 and 29 (Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Okada)

Claims 5 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Okada. Claim 5 depends from base claim 1 and claim 29 depends from base claim 23. The Office Action relies on Okada for disclosing a display facility that is a television. (Office Action, p. 6.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Okada fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka to support a Section 103 rejection of base claims 1 and 23. Accordingly, claims 5 and 29 are allowable over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Okada for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claims 1 and 23, and the additional features of dependent claims 5 and 29. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claims 5 and 29 should be withdrawn.

C. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claim 9 (Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Chen)

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Chen. Claim 9 depends from claim 1. The Office Action relies on Chen for disclosing a top side of the playing device. (Office Action, p. 7.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Chen fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka to support a Section 103 rejection of base claim 1. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Chen for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claim 1 and the additional features of dependent claim 9. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claim 9 should be withdrawn.

D. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claim 13 (Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Whitted)

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Whitted. Claim 13 depends from claim 1. The Office Action relies on Whitted for disclosing a stacked arrangement for the modules. (Office Action, p. 8.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Whitted fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka to support a Section 103 rejection of base claim 1. Accordingly, claim 13 is allowable over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Whitted for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claim 1 and the additional features of dependent claim 13. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claim 13 should be withdrawn.

E. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 21 and 22 (Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Muzaffer)

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Muzaffer. Claims 21 and 22 depend from base claim 1. The Office Action relies on Muzaffer for disclosing an 802.11 wireless, an IDE, or a SCSI link. (Office Action, p. 9.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Muzaffer fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takihara, Childers, and Tanaka to support a Section 103 rejection of base claim 1. Accordingly, claims 21 and 22 are allowable over the combination of Takihara, Childers, Tanaka, and Muzaffer for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claim 1 and the additional features of dependent claims 21 and 22. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claims 21 and 22 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Cameron Pilling at (206) 359-6123.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP



Cameron B. Pilling
Registration No. 62,085

Date: November 21, 2008

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 25096
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8000